

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 59-66, 68-70, and 72-74 are pending in this application. Claims 59 and 72-74 are amended. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 59-60, 62-66, 68-70 and 72-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Bickford (U.S. Patent No. 4,117,614); Claim 61 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bickford in view of Marx (U.S. Patent No. 3,425,147); and Claim 74 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bickford.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 59-60, 62-66, 68-70 and 72-73 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Bickford, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent Claim 59 recites a refrigerator shelf including, *inter alia*:

...  
a plurality of coverpieces, at least one of said coverpieces being a cornerpiece positioned to cover only one of the plurality of corners of the at least one support panel, at least one of said coverpieces including at least one attachment portion projecting from a surface of said coverpiece, said at least one attachment portion configured to attach said shelf in a refrigerator chassis in a substantially horizontal configuration.

One non-limiting example of an attachment portion is shown in Figures 4a and 4b of the present application. As discussed in the specification at page 14, lines 4-5, attachment portion 27 may be used to attach the shelf to a chassis. Another non-limiting example is the portions 18, 19, 20, and 21 shown in Figures 3a and 3b and described at page 13, lines 10-17.

In contrast, Bickford discloses a picture frame comprising four frame legs that telescopically slide into or over the adjacent frame leg.<sup>1</sup> This allows pictures of varying size to be framed by the adjustable picture frame. At page 2, line 24 to page 3, line 4, the

---

<sup>1</sup>See Bickford, abstract and Figure 2.

outstanding Office Action cited the surface of back leg section 31 as “at least one attachment portion.” However, back leg section 31 is the surface of frame section 11, which is cited by the outstanding Office action as “a coverpiece.”<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, back leg section 31 is not “at least one attachment portion *projecting from a surface of said coverpiece*,” as back leg section 31 is the surface of the coverpiece itself. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Bickford does not describe any portion projecting from a surface of frame sections 11 and 12 configured to attach the picture frame described by Bickford in a chassis in a substantially horizontal configuration. Accordingly, Bickford does not teach or suggest “at least one attachment portion projecting from a surface of said coverpiece, said at least one attachment portion configured to attach said shelf in a refrigerator chassis in a substantially horizontal configuration,” as recited in Claim 59.

Since Bickford does not teach each and every element of Claim 59, Claim 59 and the claims dependent therefrom are not anticipated by Bickford and are patentable thereover.

Amended independent Claims 72 and 73 recite similar elements to Claim 59. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 72 and 73 are patentable over Bickford for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 59.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 61 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bickford in view of Marx, that rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Marx describes fastener 17 located on one side of the frame. Fastener 17 is configured to hang the frame in a vertical configuration, for example on a wall, as shown in Figure 6 of Marx. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that neither Bickford nor Marx teaches or suggests “at least one attachment portion projecting from a surface of said coverpiece, said at least one attachment portion configured to attach said shelf in a refrigerator chassis in a substantially horizontal configuration,” as recited in Claim 59. Thus, Bickford and Marx,

---

<sup>2</sup>See outstanding Office Action, page 3, line 6.

Application No. 09/600,860  
Reply to Office Action of October 3, 2005

taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of Claim 59, from which Claim 61 depends. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 61 is patentable over Bickford and Marx.


With respect to the rejection of Claim 74 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bickford, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Bickford does not teach or suggest at least one attachment portion projecting from a surface of said coverpiece, the at least one attachment portion configured to attach a shelf in a refrigerator chassis in a substantially horizontal configuration, as recited in Claim 74. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 74 is patentable over Bickford.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

Edward Tracy  
Registration No. 47,998

I:\ATTY\ET\194112US\194112US-AMD1.3.06.DOC